BUDGET RESOLUTION/Student Loan Increase, Tax Expenditure Offset

SUBJECT: Senate Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 1996-2002 . . . S. Con. Res. 13. Domenici (for Snowe) amendment No. 1197.

ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 67-32

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. Con. Res. 13, the fiscal year 1996 Concurrent Budget Resolution, will reduce projected spending over 7 years to balance the budget by fiscal year (FY) 2002 without increasing taxes. Savings that will accrue from lower debt service payments (an estimated \$170 billion) will be dedicated to a reserve fund, which may be used for tax reductions after enactment of laws to ensure a balanced budget. Highlights include the following: the rate of growth in Medicare will be slowed to 7.1 percent; Medicaid's rate of growth will be slowed to 5 percent and it will be transformed into a block grant program; the Commerce Department and more than 100 other Federal programs, agencies, and commissions will be eliminated; welfare and housing programs will be reformed; agriculture, energy, and transportation subsidies will be cut; foreign aid will be cut; defense spending will be cut and then allowed to increase back to its 1995 level; and Social Security will not be altered.

The Domenici (for Snowe) amendment would decrease by \$9.4 billion the reconciliation instructions to the Labor Committee to achieve direct spending savings, and would instruct the Finance Committee to raise an additional \$9.4 billion in revenue. Further, the amendment would express the sense of the Senate that cuts in student loans should be minimized, and that the current tax exclusion for income of Foreign Sales Corporations should be eliminated.

The amendment was offered after all debate time had expired. However, some statements on amendments were added to the record or were made before the amendments were offered and before debate time had expired. Also, by unanimous consent, 1 minute of time was allowed on each amendment for explanatory statements before each vote.

Those favoring the amendment contended:

In the waning moments of this debate a spirit of bipartisanship has returned to the Senate on the issue of education. The Snowe

(See other side)

YEAS (67)			NAYS (32)			NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans	Democrats (44 or 98%)		Republicans (31 or 57%)		Democrats (1 or 2%)	Republicans Democrats	
(23 or 43%)						(0)	(1)
Bennett Campbell Chafee Cochran Cohen D'Amato DeWine Domenici Frist Grassley Hatch Hatfield Jeffords Kassebaum Pressler Roth Santorum Shelby Simpson Snowe Specter Stevens Warner	Akaka Baucus Biden Bingaman Boxer Bradley Bryan Bumpers Byrd Conrad Daschle Dodd Dorgan Exon Feingold Feinstein Ford Glenn Graham Harkin Heflin Hollings	Inouye Johnston Kennedy Kerrey Kerry Kohl Lautenberg Leahy Levin Lieberman Moseley-Braun Moynihan Murray Nunn Pell Pryor Reid Robb Rockefeller Sarbanes Simon Wellstone	Abraham Ashcroft Bond Brown Burns Coats Coverdell Craig Dole Faircloth Gorton Gramm Grams Gregg Helms	Hutchison Inhofe Kempthorne Kyl Lott Lugar Mack McCain McConnell Murkowski Nickles Packwood Smith Thomas Thompson Thurmond	Breaux	EXPLANAT 1—Official 1 2—Necessar 3—Illness 4—Other SYMBOLS: AY—Annou AN—Annou PY—Paired PN—Paired	ily Absent unced Yea unced Nay Yea

VOTE NO. 231 MAY 25, 1995

amendment, we are pleased to say, would restore \$9.4 billion to the guaranteed student loan program, which is vital for low-income college students across America. The amendment suggests cutting a current tax loophole for foreign sales corporations, but we emphasize that this suggestion is in no way binding. Senators Murray, Kerry, Kennedy, and Biden have all argued strongly in favor of keeping that loophole in order to protect high-tech industries in their States. We are sensitive to their concerns, and pledge to try to find a different funding source. Whatever the funding source, though, we are pleased that the Snowe amendment would increase spending on education by \$9.4 billion, and we urge our colleagues to give this amendment their endorsement.

Those opposing the amendment contended:

The Snowe amendment proposes a tax increase. We agree that the particular tax increase in this amendment would be justified as part of a revenue-neutral tax reform package, but we certainly do not support it as a means of raising total revenue. Our colleagues have not made their proposal out of any interest in reform--they have made it as a means of collecting more in taxes. Tax loopholes should be closed, and with that closure the tax burden on the American people should be lessened by a commensurate amount. One of the reasons the American people have to pay so much in taxes is that some people and groups have been given special tax exemptions. The solution is not simply to take away those exemptions and make everyone pay the same high tax rates, thereby letting the Government spend even more money; the solution is to take away the exemptions and lower tax rates, thereby keeping Government spending at the same level. Our ultimate preference, of course, would be to lower tax rates even further and to cut Government spending.

Though we agree with the goal of increasing funding for education, we think that it is reckless and irresponsible to increase the level of overall Federal spending by \$9.4 billion in order to do so. Over the next 7 years the Federal Government will spend \$12 trillion; if our colleagues cannot find \$9.4 billion in spending out of this \$12 trillion that is of lower priority than educational spending, then they themselves ought to go back to school. We can count heads; we know this amendment is going to pass. After it passes, it is our intention to work to keep the increased educational funding in this amendment, but to pay for it with spending cuts instead of a tax increase. For now, though, we must vote against it, to protest the fact that it advocates an increase in the amount of revenue collected in order to provide this \$9.4 billion.